

REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed May 3, 2005.

Claims 11, 12 and 30 and 43 have been canceled without prejudice to Applicants' right to prosecute the subject matter in any divisional, continuation, continuation-in-part or other application. Claims 1, 26 and 41 have been amended. Some of the amendments are to merely correct dependency of the claims. No new matter is believed to have been introduced.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 11, 12, 30 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 11-12, 30 and 43 have been canceled without prejudice, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Claims 11, 12, 30 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Office Action alleged that there is no evidence that the

electrical properties presently claimed could exist in a monocrystalline substrate further comprising amorphous or porous silicon immediately adjacent to the organic layer. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 11-12, 30 and 43 have been canceled without prejudice, thus rendering the rejection moot.

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In particular, the Office Action alleges that claim 41 depends from claim 1 and recites a substrate prior to conversion and thus recites a substrate both prior to and after treatment. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to amended claim 41.

Claim 41 has been amended to correct dependency from claim 1 to claim 13. Applicants believe this overcomes the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 4, 5, 11, 13, 16, 17, 21, 25-27, 30, 41 and 43-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,429,708 (hereinafter Linford et al.). Applicants respectfully traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Claims 30 and 43 have been canceled thus the rejection is moot with respect to these claims. Applicants respectfully submit that Linford et al. do not anticipate the amended claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 1, 4, 13, 16, 21-24, 41, 43-47, and 49-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by the article Bansal et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 43 has been canceled thus the rejection is moot with respect to this claim. Applicants respectfully submit that Bansal et al. do not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

III. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §1034 as allegedly obvious over Linford in view of Aboaf et al. Applicants respectfully traverse with respect to the pending claims. Claim 12 has been canceled thus the rejection is moot.

Claims 13 and 21-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly obvious over Tsukune et al. in view of Wolf et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection with respect to the pending claims.


Neither of the cited references teach or suggest a monocrystalline layer substantially free of oxidation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Filed concurrently herewith is a petition for extension of time, extending the period for response up to and including September 3, 2005. No other fee is believed to be due. Should any required fee be due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge, or credit, deposit account no. 02-4800.

Respectfully submitted,

Buchanan Ingersoll, L.L.P.

Date: 9/2/05

By: 
Joseph R. Baker, Jr.
Registration No. 40,900

Buchanan Ingersoll, LLP
Suite 300
12230 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
(858) 509-7300